UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,866	10/743,866 12/24/2003 Eui-Sun Hong		1568.1082	9364
49455 STEIN MCEW	7590 03/04/201 EN. LLP	EXAMINER		
1400 EYE STR SUITE 300		ECHELMEYER, ALIX ELIZABETH		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptomail@smiplaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/743,866	HONG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer	1795		

	Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>	:		·
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an ex	pianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.  The request for reconsideration has been consider because:  See Continuation Sheet.			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/PATRICK RYAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not found to be persuasive.

Applicant states, in the final paragraph of page 5 of the Remarks, that Morishita et al. teach that ultrasonic welding cannot be used to attach a nickel layer to the can because of the insolubility of the lead plate (meaning electrical lead, not lead the element),

Then, on page 6, Applicant argues that the coating process of Slezak would not have a reasonable expectation of success because Morishita et al. teach that resistance welding and ultrasonic welding should not be used to attach the nickel layer to the can.

The examiner finds that Applicant has not shown that there would be no expectation of success. Morishita et al. teach that other welding methods of attaching the nickel layer cannot be used because they would not be effective on the lead plate, but it is clear from Slezak that a nickel layer can be applied to a substrate using a coating technique, which the skilled artisan will recognize as different from a welding technique. The skilled artisan would have a reasonable expectation that nickel can be plated, because it is plated in Slezak. The teachings relied upon by Applicant concerning the welding methods of Morishita et al. are not convincing in this instance because a reasonable expectation of success of plating nickel as opposed to welding it using any of the above discussed welding techniques is found in the teachings of Slezak.